



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY M. H. SEGAL, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

II

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.*

32. THE Book of Samuel relates the story of the origin and establishment of the monarchy in Israel. The author does not aim, at least in the first part, at giving us a history of the period. He contents himself with placing before the reader a number of vivid sketches of the lives and acts of the chief personalities who effected the great transformation in the national life of Israel. The real heroes of the book are only two: Samuel and David. The third great personality of the period, King Saul, does not occupy in the mind of the writer a position of such prominence as the other two. The story of his life and works is throughout made subordinate to the story of one or the other of the two principal heroes.¹⁸ Thus in chs. 8-15 Saul is treated as a mere appendage to Samuel, and in chs. 16 ff. as a mere appendage to David. There are also other lesser personalities whose history is dealt with in our book, but only in so far as they have a more or less direct connexion with the two principal heroes. Such personalities are Eli and his sons, Jonathan, Ishbosheth and Abner, Absalom and Sheba, and

* Cf. above, pp. 267 ff.

¹⁸ This statement refers only to the author of our book. The sources used by him may have been written from quite different points of view.

many others. They serve everywhere but as a foil to set off in greater clearness the fortunes and achievements of Samuel and David. We may thus divide the book into two principal parts: the Story of Samuel, I, 1-16. 13; and the Story of David, I, 16-II, 24.¹⁹ It must, however, be confessed that this division is adopted purely for our own convenience. There is nothing in the book itself to signalize the conclusion of one story and the beginning of another. On the contrary, the author has purposely contrived his narrative in such a fashion that one division glides into the other quite naturally and almost imperceptibly, without any break whatever between the two.

THE STORY OF SAMUEL.

The story of the life and work of Samuel is given by our author in three distinct portions: (1) Birth and childhood of the prophet—Samuel and Eli, chs. 1-7. 1; (2) The prophet in his manhood—Samuel as Judge, ch. 7. 2-17; (3) The prophet in his old age—the establishment of the Monarchy, chs. 8-16. 13.

1. BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF SAMUEL.

33. (ch. 1.) The account of the birth of Samuel and his presentation to the sanctuary in Shiloh, which is given in ch. 1, is told by the author entirely in his own words. Ver. 3 b has been advanced as evidence that the chapter is a continuation of a longer account in which details were given about Eli and the sanctuary of Shiloh. But vers. 1-2, which read like the beginning of a new history, do not

¹⁹ 1 Kings chs. 1-2 also belong to the story of the establishment of the Monarchy; but in this paper we are only concerned with the Book of Samuel.

support this theory. Moreover, the text of 3 b is uncertain. The reading of the LXX is: 'ושם עלי ושני בניו ח' ופ'. It is, however, questionable whether the LXX reading is the more original. For, while it may be explained as a deliberate correction of MT, designed to give a formal introduction of Eli also, it is difficult to explain how MT could have arisen out of the reading of the LXX. Perhaps Eli's presence at Shiloh was so well known to the author's contemporaries as to require no special mention. Further, it must be noted that, owing to his extreme old age, Eli no longer officiated as priest; cf. 2. 12 ff. and ver. 22. Budde's reading 'ושם עלי בהן לה' (*Richter u. Samuel*, 196) is certainly wrong; for the sons, as well as Eli himself, require a special introduction by name. Their names in 4. 4, 11, 17 seem from their order in the sentence to be a gloss. Yet Phineas is mentioned in 4. 19 without the epithet of בני, which proves that he had already been described before. But, omitting the names in 4. 4, 11, 17, he is only mentioned by name in 1. 3 b, a fact which supports the reading of MT or LXX.

34. (ch. 2.) The insertion of the Psalm of Hannah in 2. 1-10 may have been made by the author himself. In the same way the author inserted the elegies in II, 1. 18-27 and II, 3. 33-4. The poem is not so late as the critics maintain. When we come to investigate its construction and contents in a later instalment of these STUDIES, we shall show that the last two lines

ויתן עז למלכו
וירם קרן משיחו

are a later liturgical addition. But such an addition could only have been made in the period of the Monarchy;

hence the poem itself must belong to the middle or early period of the Monarchy. However, it seems more probable that, like the poems in II, 22; 23. 1-7, the Psalm was placed here by a later scribe. This view is favoured by the textual variations immediately before and after the poem (1. 28 b; 2. 11 a) exhibited by MT and various recensions of LXX, which tend to prove that the text had been retouched and left in a state of uncertainty through the insertion of the poem. But this would not have been the case had the poem been inserted by the author himself.

35. From Samuel's presentation to the Sanctuary the author passes on in 2. 11 ff. to narrate the story of Samuel's childhood. Here the author had to tell how Samuel developed from his early childhood into a pious and trusted servant of God; how he became a prophet, and what was the subject of his first prophecy. He had further to describe the events which resulted in the return of Samuel to Ramah, and in his becoming the only guide and leader of the nation. He had to narrate the story of the destruction of the house of Eli, and of the capture and wanderings of the Ark, which deprived Israel of a religious centre, and of its former leaders, the priests. But the author did not choose, as in ch. 1, to tell this part of his story in his own words. He preferred, as in chs. 9 and 17, to embody in his narrative portions of an older document describing these events. These borrowed portions are to be found in 2. 12-17; 22-5; 27-36; ch. 4. The arguments for such a view are set forth from a different standpoint by Dr. H. P. Smith in his *International Critical Commentary on Samuel*, pp. xix-xx. The passages enumerated are silent about Samuel. They do not necessarily presuppose the particulars given in the rest of the narrative.

This latter, on the other hand, is dependent on the story of the house of Eli, and is artificially connected with it by the links in 2. 11 b, 18, 26; 3. 1 a. The Eli portions of ch. 2 may easily be removed from their present context, and joined together into a tolerably connected and independent narrative. The Samuel portions, on the other hand, cannot be separated from their present context in a similar manner. Since, therefore, the Eli story is indispensable for the development of the story of Samuel's childhood, and as such forms an integral part of it, it is obvious that the verses enumerated above are not merely redactional links, but really belong to the author of the story of Samuel's childhood. Hence we are led to the conclusion that the author of the Samuel story incorporated into his narrative material from an older source describing the fortunes of the house of Eli, and linked it up with his own account of Samuel.

36. The same arguments apply also to chs. 4 and 5-6. In none of them is there any mention of Samuel.²⁰ This silence about Samuel does not, however, prove, as the critics maintain, that the older document knew nothing of Samuel's greatness. It only proves that owing to his youthfulness at that time, Samuel did not exercise any influence on the events narrated; and further, that the older writer was not specially interested in the story of Samuel. Our own author, on the other hand, has his exclusive interest in the story of Samuel, and had chs. 4-6 been his own original composition, he would no doubt have contrived by one means or another to connect the events of these chapters with the life of his hero, just as he did in chs. 2-3.

²⁰ On 4. 1 a see Driver's note *ad loc.*

37. According to this view, the prophecy in 2. 27-36 is older than our author's own work, i. e. older than ch. 3.²¹ The majority of the critics, however, regard this passage as a post-Deuteronomic production. They think that in its original form the prophecy predicted the transference of the religious leadership from Eli to Samuel, but that a later editor brought the prophecy into connexion with the fall of Ebiathar and the rise of Zadok in the days of Solomon (1 Kings 2. 27). This theory is, however, far-fetched and altogether improbable. Had the prophecy ever been directly connected with the rise of Samuel as religious leader, this connexion would surely have secured the preservation of the prophecy in its original form. And how, it may be asked, could it have been predicted that Samuel would replace Eli and his sons, seeing that Samuel never acted as an official priest, never employed the Ephod in giving oracles, nor did he ever derive any revenues from the priesthood? The contention of the critics that the prophecy is post-Deuteronomic because ver. 36 can only refer to the centralization of the sacrificial worship in the Jerusalem Temple effected by Josiah (2 Kings 23. 8 ff.) is not at all convincing. We have no evidence for this gratuitous identification of the descendants of Ebiathar with the priests of the *Bamoth*. The condition of the house of Eli described in ver. 36 may have existed already in the days of Solomon. The expulsion of Ebiathar from Jerusalem and the rise of Solomon's Temple may have rendered it difficult for the members of the Ebiathar family to find a subsistence as priests. The great *Bamoth* must all have had their own hereditary priesthoods, and as their importance continually declined through the rise

²¹ Cf. Budde, *op. cit.*, 200.

of the sanctuary in the capital, there would have been no room in them for new-comers. And private *Bamoth* had no need of official priests. Thus it may very well have happened even in the days of Solomon and his immediate successors that descendants of Eli came to Jerusalem to beg of the Zadokites for some menial office in the Temple, in order to secure 'a morsel of bread'. This would imply that the prophecy was written down after the erection of Solomon's Temple. This is supported by the anachronistic reference to the king in ver. 35 b β (cf. § 42). On the other hand, it is also possible that vers. 35-6 are a later addition to the prophecy.

38. There is, however, one critic, C. Steuernagel, who goes much farther in his analysis of our passage.²² He holds that the prophecy is of a highly composite character. The first part, consisting of vers. 31 a, 33 a α (to מוכחי, 35 b (without אנשים), was originally a prediction of the slaying of Nob's priesthood by Saul. The second part, consisting of vers. 35-6, is a later addition written after the first part had wrongly become associated with the general fall of Eli's house in the deposition of Ebiathar. This theory is based upon an alleged discrepancy between ver. 33 a and ver. 36. In ver. 33 a it is stated that only one man would be spared of the whole house of Eli, viz. Ebiathar (cf. 22. 20 f.), whereas in ver. 36 it is implied that the whole house of Eli would survive, though in a reduced and humiliated condition. But the latter idea is also implied in ver. 31 b, and ver. 32. Hence, to maintain his discrepancy, our critic declares ver. 31 b and ver. 32 along with 33 a β to be an interpolation! Such is the

²² Carl Steuernagel, 'Die Weissagung über die Eliden' in *Alttestamentliche Studien für R. Kittel* (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 204 ff.

manner in which modern criticism deals with the text of Scripture: first it constructs a theory; then it proceeds to search in the text for evidence of the theory; having by a misinterpretation of the text found its 'evidence', it proceeds to cut out from the text anything that tends to invalidate the 'evidence'. The fact is that this critic errs, along with all moderns, in his interpretation of ver. 33 a. *וַאִישׁ לֹא אֲכַרִּית מִמֶּךָ* does not mean that *one particular man* will not be cut off. This would have been expressed by *וַאִישׁ אֶחָד לֹא אֲכַרִּית*. The phrase has the same meaning here as in 1 Kings 2. 4; 8. 25; 9. 5, viz. that his house would not be cut off entirely, but that *some one* will always be spared to him in order to testify to his degradation.²³ Thus, the whole fanciful interpretation of ver. 33 a as referring to Ebiathar, and with it the whole of Steuernagel's elaborate thesis, falls to the ground. The truth is, as we have already said, that the prophecy is older than the Samuel story, and thus older also than Samuel's prophecy in ch. 3, as distinctly stated in 3. 12. The antiquity of our passage is proved, as Steuernagel himself observes, by the mention of the carrying of the Ephod as one of the chief functions of the priest. We should, however, omit ver. 31 b as an explanatory gloss derived from ver. 32 b. It is also absent from LXX B. Another gloss to be omitted from our text is found in ver. 22 b β (*וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר וְכִי*), which is also absent from LXX B.²⁴ Its purpose may have been

²³ Cf. the comments *ad loc.* of Qimḥi, R. Isaiah, and Ralbag, the latter of whom says: כִּדִּי שִׁירָאוּ בִּרְעֵתָם בְּהִיּוֹתָם תַּחַת כֶּהֱן מֹשֶׁל עֲלֵיהֶם תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הִיתָה לָהֶם הַמְּשֻׁלָּה לִּלְוִי זֶה הַחֲמָט וְלִזְאת הַסִּבָּה לֹא יָמוּתוּ בְּנֵיךְ בְּעוֹדָם קִטְנִים אֲבָל יָמוּתוּ בְּהִיּוֹתָם אֲנָשִׁים בְּדֶרֶךְ שִׁירָאוּ שְׁפֻלּוֹתָם וְדִלּוֹתָם בַּעֲבוּרָת הַכֹּהֵנוֹת.

²⁴ N. Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- u. Literarkritik d. Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg

to offer an explanation why such a terrible retribution was inflicted upon Eli and his sons, since the sin mentioned in vers. 15–17 did not appear to have been of so grievous a character as to deserve such punishment.

39. (ch. 3.) Ch. 3 is, as we have said above, by the author himself. The briefness and vagueness of the prophecy in vers. 11–14 are strong proofs that the author of this chapter already had before him the prophecy in 2. 27 ff. The theory of Steuernagel (*loc. cit.*) that Samuel's prophecy in this chapter was deliberately mutilated, in order to amplify the anonymous prophecy in 2. 27 ff., and that 3. 12 is a 'redactional' insertion is extremely improbable. No redactor would have dared to transfer a prophecy of the great Samuel to some unknown 'man of God'. 3. 1 b does not assert that there was no prophetic activity at all prior to the revelation to Samuel, but only that such activity was exceedingly rare.

40. (ch. 4.) Ch. 4 belongs to the Eli document, and was incorporated by the author from the same source as the Eli portions in ch. 2. Probably chs. 5–7. 1 also belongs to this source, forming the continuation, mediate or immediate, of ch. 4. We must agree with the critics in describing 6. 15 as an interpolation, similar to the interpolation in II, 13. 24.

2. SAMUEL IN HIS MANHOOD.

41. (ch. 7.) In 7. 2 the author resumes his own composition with an account of Samuel's activity in his middle age. Samuel is represented as the religious leader and

im Breisgau, 1899), p. 103, argues for the opposite view that the absence of the clause in LXX is due to deliberate omission. But the description of the Sanctuary of Shilo as **אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** is decisive against the genuineness of the clause; cf. Driver's note *ad loc.*

Judge of the people. His activity is exclusively of a religious character. He does, indeed, secure a great victory over the Philistines, but only by his intercession with God. The critics are unanimous in denying the historicity of the victory in vers. 7-14. It is true that ver. 14 cannot be correct of Samuel's time. On the other hand, as we have pointed out above (§ 18), it is quite possible that the Philistines did suffer a defeat at the hands of the Israelites in a more or less important engagement during Samuel's manhood, and that, whether as a result of this defeat or of some other factors of which we have no knowledge, the Israelites were left in peace for some considerable time. The statements in vers. 13-14 may have been coloured by the state of things prevailing in the author's own time, so that his general description is merely anachronistic, but not quite devoid of historical truth. The author certainly sought to magnify the political achievements of his hero, but it is unjust to accuse him of deliberate invention or falsification. Wellhausen's theory (*Composition, &c.*³, 240) that the story of the victory at Ebenezer is a deliberate concoction to redeem the defeat at the same place in 4. 1 ff., may be ingenious, but it is certainly incorrect. It is evident that the Ebenezer near the low-lying Aphek, wherever that locality was situated, cannot be identical with Ebenezer near Mizpah in the mountains. There is no reason why there should not have been two sacred stones of the same name.

3. SAMUEL IN HIS OLD AGE.

The Election of Saul.

We have already discussed at some length in the first part of this paper the composition of chs. 8-12. Here it

will suffice to state the conclusion which we reached there, viz. that the whole section emanates from the hand of our author. Chs. 9–10. 16 he borrowed from an older work; all the rest of the section, including the whole of ch. 11, is his own original composition.

42. (ch. 12.) Critics indicate in ch. 12 a number of expressions and phrases which they characterize as Deuteronomic. As the present writer has not made a detailed and independent study of the higher criticism of the Pentateuch, he is not prepared either to accept or to reject this characterization. His experience of the critics in their treatment of the historical books of the Bible has not inspired him with confidence in the validity of their reasoning and in the soundness of their conclusions. But this much may be admitted, that ch. 12 is somewhat different in style from the other portions of our author's work. This is, however, not conclusive against the genuineness or the integrity of the chapter. A homily must necessarily differ in style and diction from the description of a battle or of the life of a primitive sanctuary. Nor need we be surprised at finding in this chapter phrases and expressions which are common to other parts of Scripture. The style and phraseology of hortatory religious literature may have become conventionalized at an early period, and their occurrence in our chapter need not necessarily be a sign of a late date. As for the mention of the name of Samuel placed in his own mouth in ver. 11, it is only another example of the author's habit of slipping into anachronisms, such as we have met with in 2. 35; 7. 14; and 16. 18 (cp. above, §§ 37, 41, 23). On the other hand, ver. 12 does indeed present a difficulty, but this difficulty becomes all the greater if we accept the analysis of the

critics. For according to their analysis this chapter belongs to E, who represents Israel as living in a condition of the most profound peace as the effect of Samuel's victory in 7. 10 f., and who holds that the demand for a king sprang from no other motive except the desire of being like the heathens. But in this verse the writer tells us that the motive of the demand for a king was the fear inspired by the Ammonite king who had invaded Israelitish territory. The critics try to get over the difficulty in their usual fashion ; ver. 12, they say, is the invention of a redactor (cf. Budde, *op. cit.*, 187). But how could any person who has read ch. 8 ff. invent such a story and actually insert it in the text? No, the statement in this verse cannot be purely an invention ; it must be based upon some actual fact. We do not possess a full and detailed history of the period. For, as has been pointed out above (§ 32) our author does not present us with a history, but only with stories and sketches of the life and works of certain great personalities. It is therefore quite possible that he read in his sources an account of an Ammonite invasion of Israel in Samuel's old age, which had caused great anxiety to the people. According to Judges 10. 7-9, there was an Ammonite oppression of Israel contemporaneous with the Philistine oppression. The attack on Jabesh-gilead (ch. 11) may have been only an incident, though the most humiliating one, of a long campaign. The people may perhaps have become reconciled for a time to the Philistine yoke, but the Ammonite impudence was too much for their sorely-tried patience, and hence the insistent demand for a king who would *fight their battles* ; cf. 8. 22 a.

*The Rejection of Saul and the Adventure of Jonathan,
chs. 13-15.*

43. (ch. 13.) The account of the acts of Samuel in his old age is continued by our author in chs. 13-15. As in the previous sections, so also here, the author incorporated into his work an extract from an older source, most probably the same source from which he derived chs. 9-10. 16. This extract extends from 13. 2²⁵ to 14. 46. We are led to this conclusion first by the style and diction of 13. 2-14. 46, which is markedly different from that of the preceding chapters; and secondly by the account of the rejection of Saul given in 13. 8-14. This comparatively tame story could not have been told by one who had written, or even known, the impressive story of ch. 15. It is evident that 13. 8-14 is older than ch. 15. Its presence in our book beside the magnificent later account can only be explained on the supposition that our author incorporated it as part of a longer extract from an old source. He no doubt thought that both stories were true, and that the sentence of rejection was pronounced on Saul twice. As 10. 8 is intended to prepare the reader for this account of the rejection of Saul, we have no hesitation in declaring 13. 2-14. 46 to be a part of the same document as 9-10. 16.

44. The critics, however, have unanimously decreed that 13. 7 b-15 a, as also its antecedent in 10. 8, are an interpolation. They maintain that the proper sequel to 13. 7 a is ver. 15 b. But this is not apparent. Ver. 7 a joins just as well to ver. 7 b as to ver. 15 b. Ver. 15 a does not,

²⁵ 13. 1, which is incomplete and absent from LXX B, is unquestionably a later addition; cf. Driver's note.

indeed, join well to ver. 15 b, but only in MT, which has lost a great part of the verse through *homoioteleuton*.²⁶ If we restore the text as in LXX, which has no doubt preserved the original, we obtain a smooth and intelligible connexion between the two parts of the verse.

45. Again, the critics argue that it is impossible to believe that Saul would have abandoned the highlands of Gibeah to the invading Philistines, and gone down East to Gilgal for no other purpose than to offer a sacrifice at the local sanctuary. But Saul did not abandon the highlands. He left behind him a defender in Jonathan with whatever force he could muster on the spot. And he did not go to Gilgal merely to offer a sacrifice, but chiefly to muster the Israelitish levies from across the Jordan and the North, which had assembled at Gilgal as their trysting-place. This is expressly stated in ver. 4 b, a clause which the critics have either overlooked or misunderstood.²⁷ The critics argue further that the test put to Saul was a senseless one. '*War Samuel bei Sinnen?*' asks Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 245) with his characteristic audacity. The danger of waiting seven days was so great. But that is exactly the reason why Saul was put to this particular test. The penetrating eye of Samuel must have at once discovered the chief failing in Saul's character, viz. his lack of patience, his rash and reckless impulsiveness. Even our scanty records offer us abundant illustration of this failing in the king's character. Note, for instance, his rash oath in 14. 24;²⁸ his outburst against Jonathan in 20. 30 ff.; his

²⁶ Cf. Driver's note.

²⁷ The excision in ver. 4 b of הַגִּלְגָּל, or its change into הַגִּבְעָתָה, proposed by some critics, is altogether unwarranted.

²⁸ Cf. particularly the text of LXX; see Driver's note *ad loc.*

murder of the priests, 22. 16. He was given an opportunity by the prophet to prove his patience and his faith in face of danger ; he failed, and was rejected. Samuel's judgement has been severely criticized by some of our modern shilly-shally sentimentalists, but history, which is the sole arbitress in such matters, has fully upheld the justice of the prophet's sentence. Saul failed largely because of the failings of his character ; his rival David succeeded largely because of his virtues, his patience, his perseverance and self-discipline. That the danger of waiting seven days was after all not so great as the critics assert, is proved by the victorious issue of the war, an issue which would have been much more decisive in favour of the Israelites but for the rashness and impulsiveness of Saul.

46. But, say the critics, Saul *did* fulfil the test ; he waited seven days ; why then was he rejected ? The answer is that the decision whether the test had been fulfilled or not must be left to the narrator. He alone is capable of forming a judgement on the question. His decision is that the test had not been fulfilled, and we must, therefore, conclude that the seven days had not been quite completed when Saul proceeded to offer the sacrifice. Further, the critics ask, why is there no trace of this ominous meeting with Samuel in the subsequent history of the war ? Neither Saul, nor Jonathan, nor the people betray in their words or actions any trace of the rejection of Saul. But the *argumentum e silentio* is particularly unconvincing in this instance. Jonathan must have been at the time of the occurrence of the incident away at Gibeah, guarding the passes against the Philistines. The people possibly did not overhear the conversation between the Prophet and the King. Saul's rejection may have

been as private as his anointment.²⁹ As for Saul himself, who can tell what thoughts troubled his mind? Perhaps we may trace the hesitation and lack of initiative which he displays in the subsequent course of the campaign to some mental depression caused by the fateful sentence passed on him by Samuel. His anxiety for ritual exactness in the midst of hard fighting may, perhaps, also have been due to a desire to secure a reconciliation with God and His Prophet. The author himself refrains from saying anything on the state of Saul's mind, because he was too good a literary artist to spoil his spirited narrative by such intrusions. Finally, the critics complain that this episode interrupts the smooth course of the main narrative. This is to some extent true, but such interruption is natural to all episodes, whether original or not.

47. We see no cogent reason for branding the passage as an interpolation, except, perhaps, the fact that it entirely upsets one of the chief theories upon which the critics base their analysis of chs. 8-12, viz., that in chs. 9-10. 16, of which ch. 13 is the continuation, Samuel is represented as merely a village seer without national importance or authority. For in this passage Samuel appears as the great national prophet and leader, almost exactly as in ch. 8; 10. 17 ff. and ch. 12. But we have seen above (§ 16) that this theory of the critics is altogether without any justification. We may, therefore, safely assert that the disputed passage forms an original and integral part of ch. 13. It is the earlier account of the well-known historical fact of the breach between Samuel and Saul. In fact, it is chiefly this passage which

²⁹ From 15. 30a it may be inferred that the conversation between Saul and Samuel recorded there was of a private character.

has secured the incorporation into our book of the whole extract in 13. 2-14, 46. Our author himself, unlike his sources, had his chief interest in Samuel and not in Saul. There is no reason why he should have troubled to supply us with a detailed account of this war with the Philistines, and not rather of Saul's other wars with the Philistines, or of Saul's wars with the other nations, enumerated in 14. 47, or of his struggle against the Gibeonites (II, 21. 2) or with the soothsayers (28. 9), except that the story of this war contained the episode 13. 8-14 which revealed the greatness of Samuel. And having given the beginning of the story in ch. 13, our author incorporated also its sequel in ch. 14, probably out of respect for Jonathan, the friend of his hero, David, whose valour and nobility it illustrates. It may be argued that ver. 14 b, with its clear reference to David, could not have been uttered by Samuel at that time. But even so, it is no proof against the genuineness of the passage. The words are merely a literary anachronism of the original writer, who, knowing the subsequent history of the rise of David, had put these words into the prophet's mouth.

48. In the same way we maintain that the antecedent to our passage found in 10. 8 is genuine and original to the old document in which it is found, and not an interpolation. The verse does not, as the critics allege, break the connexion between 10. 7 and 10. 9. Nor does it contradict the statement in 10. 7. The two verses refer to two different events separated by a lengthy interval of time. 10. 7 refers to the Ammonite war in ch. 11, which occurred within a month after Saul's election by the sacred lot (10. 27 b LXX), while 10. 8 refers to the Philistine war which must have taken place some years later, when the

young king's son had already reached manhood, and had become a hardy warrior. It is true that in our present text the two commands in vers. 7 and 8 appear as contemporaneous ; but our text is here fragmentary and probably abridged by the author of our book, who must have omitted a good deal of matter between ver. 7 and ver. 8. We find such an abridgement also between ver. 9 and ver. 10. Our author reproduces there only the fulfilment of the third sign, because of the explanation it gives of the well-known proverb (ver. 12 b), but omits the first two signs, which are not material to his story, and have no special interest of their own to our author or his readers. The critics further assert that 10. 8 implies that Samuel and Saul did not meet again after the latter's anointment until the episode at Gilgal (13. 8-14), thus contradicting 10. 17 ff. and 11. 12 ff. But there is no warrant in the text for such a statement. 10. 8 says nothing more than that, when a certain Philistine war had begun, Saul should go down to the sanctuary of Gilgal, and there wait seven days for the prophet's coming to offer sacrifices.

49. (ch. 14.) The genuineness of 14. 36-45 has been rightly defended by Budde (*op. cit.*, 206) and H. P. Smith (*op. cit.*, 120 f.) against the scepticism of Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 246), but 14. 47-51 has not been so lucky. This passage the critics brand as a late unhistorical panegyric modelled on, and copied from, that panegyric on David in II, ch. 8. But it is hard to understand how a late writer could venture to ascribe to Saul, the rejected of the Lord, victories which really belonged to David. On the other hand, why should not Saul have engaged in war against the nations enumerated in 14. 47-8? It is true that, with the exception of Ammon and Amalek, we have no other record in our book

of his wars against these nations. But this should not surprise us, since, as we have repeatedly stated above, our book does not pretend to give us a history of Saul's reign, but only a few sketches of his relations with Samuel and David. There are other important acts of Saul which are only incidentally referred to in our book (cf. 28. 3 ; II, 21. 1 f.). We know from the story of his pursuit of David that Saul's rule extended right into the wilds of the Negeb and south of the Dead Sea. It is, therefore, quite possible that at some time or other he, like David later on, came into conflict with the Edomites, whose territory bordered on that region. Again, his victory over the Ammonites must have brought him into collision with their neighbours, the Moabites. As a matter of fact, we find the king of Moab offering an asylum to David and his parents from the pursuit of Saul (22. 3-4), in which act he was no doubt actuated by the same motives as Akish, king of the Philistines (27. 2 ff.), viz. enmity of Saul, who had carried on war with him. Further, the description of the extent of the rule of Ishbosheth in II, 2. 9 (where read with Targum האשורי for האשרי) proves that Saul's rule reached also the northern tribes of Israel. It is, therefore, quite probable that Saul, like David after him, had to fight the aggressive kingdom of Zobah and her allies or vassals, who were neighbours of the northern tribes. Note that during his residence at Hebron, when he was carrying on a struggle against the house of Saul, we find David contracting an alliance with one of these northern kings, viz. Talmai of Geshur, by marrying his daughter Ma'akah (II, 2. 3), which tends to support the statement in 14. 47 that Saul had been at war with 'the kings of Zobah', viz. Zobah and its allies and vassals, including probably

Geshur.³⁰ Finally, of his wars against Ammon and Amalek we have detailed accounts in our book in chs. 11, 15. The whole passage 14. 47-52 may very well be the original work of our author, who wrote this brief summary in order to satisfy the curiosity of the reader. Like the similar summaries in II, ch. 8 ; 20. 23-6, it seems to be intended to mark the conclusion of a definite period in Saul's reign. It does not form, as Wellhausen³¹ and his disciples maintain, the conclusion to the whole history of Saul's reign, any more than II, 20. 23-6 forms the conclusion to the whole history of David's reign.

50. (ch. 15.) Ch. 15 is the author's own account of the rejection of Saul, as distinguished from the first account, which he reproduced from an earlier writer in 13. 8-14. Vers. 1 a, 17 b refer back to 10. 1 ; while ver. 17 a recalls 9. 21 a. In ver. 19 b we have a phrase borrowed from 14. 32 (cf. below, § 72). Ver. 28, like 28. 17, seems to have been written by one who knew, or had written, 16. 1-13. Wellhausen and his followers assert that this chapter could not have been written by the author of 14. 48. But why not? The point of view is indeed different. 14. 48 gives us a brief but true summary of the results of the Amalekite campaign for the security of the nation, while ch. 15 utilizes the same event for quite a different purpose. Hence the difference in the method of presentation between the two accounts. But the two accounts are not inconsistent, and there is no reason why the same author

³⁰ Some writers hold that Absalom's mother belonged to the Southern Geshur (27. 8 ; Josh. 13. 2). But II, 15. 8 says explicitly that this Geshur was in Aram. To assert that גֶּשׁוּר there is a gloss (S. A. Cook, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. XVI, 160) is quite arbitrary. What could have been the object of the insertion of such a gloss?

³¹ *Op. cit.*, 244 ; cf. *ibid.* 255.

could not have written of the same event in two different places, for two different purposes, and hence from two different points of view. It is, however, quite possible that our author made use in the composition of this chapter of older material, which affected both the tone and the setting of his story. It is further argued by the critics that ch. 15 should have contained some reference to the rejection in 13. 8-14. But, as we have shown above (§§ 43, 47), 13. 8-14 is not part of the author's own story. He found it as part of a larger extract which he incorporated from an older source. But he did not thereby appropriate it fully as his own, that he should have to refer back to it. However, we may be quite sure that had our chapter contained a reference to 13. 8-14, the critics would have certainly declared the reference to be a 'redactional' interpolation, as they have done with the reference in 3. 12 to 2. 27 f, and with the reference in 28. 17-18 to ch. 15.

51. Some critics declare 15. 24-31 to be an interpolation. They argue that this passage 'is wholly superfluous (!), and can be left out without disturbing the consistency of the narrative' (cf. H. P. Smith, *op. cit.*, 139). But by this sort of reasoning we may cut out also vers. 20-23 as 'wholly superfluous', &c. As a matter of fact, our passage is in no way superfluous. For it gives us a number of new details, such as the confession of Saul, the rending of the cloak and its symbolic interpretation, and the return of Samuel to the sanctuary, which are of the utmost importance to the flow of the narrative and the development of the design of the narrator. The impressiveness of the religious lesson which the writer intends to teach would be greatly weakened if Saul's guilt had not been brought home

to him so completely as to force him to a humble confession. Further, Samuel slew Agag within the Sanctuary (לפני ה', ver. 33). It is, therefore, necessary for the writer to state expressly that Samuel had come into the Sanctuary, but this is only done in this passage (vers. 25, 30, 31). The inconsistency between ver. 29 and ver. 11 (נחמתי), out of which these critics make so much capital, should occasion no difficulty. Ancient Hebrew writers were not such strict logicians as our modern critics, and their conception of the Deity often vacillates between anthropomorphism and transcendentalism; contrast Gen. 6. 6; Exod. 32. 14 (where see Ibn Ezra), &c. with Num. 23. 19.

THE STORY OF DAVID.

David and Saul.

52. (ch. 16.) The last important act of Samuel in his old age was the anointment of David recorded in 16. 1-13. This narrative serves both to conclude the story of the public life of Samuel, and also to introduce the second chief hero of our book, David son of Jesse. We have already discussed at some length in the first part of this paper the composition of chs. 16-17, but for convenience sake we will recapitulate here the conclusions arrived at there. 16. 1-13 is the direct sequel to ch. 15, and 16. 14-23 is the continuation of 16. 1-13. The whole of ch. 16 forms a unity, and is the original work of the author of our book. The same author incorporated into his work from an older source the account of David's exploit against the Philistine champion in ch. 17, but omitted from that account the portions missing in LXX B (17. 12-31; 17. 55-18. 5),

because they contradicted his own account in ch. 16. These omissions were, however, inserted later in the archetype of MT from the original old source by a scribe who regarded the author's text as a mutilation. To this scribe belongs also 17. 15, which is intended to reconcile ch. 17 with ch. 16, and the additions, consisting of 17. 41, 48 b, 50, which are not found in LXX B, and, therefore, were presumably absent also from the original text of our author. We may also assign to him some other passages found in MT but not in LXX B, e. g. 2. 22 b β (cf. § 38), 13. 1. These additions are probably the original compositions of the scribe.

53. (ch. 18.) The problem of the composition of ch. 18 is more difficult. We may state at once that the shorter text of LXX B is the original text of our author, while the MT is a later amplified and expanded recension. For, as we have remarked above in foot-note 14, assuming even that LXX B or his Hebrew original had played the rôle of the higher critic, it is impossible to explain on what grounds he could have omitted such passages as 18. 10-11, 12 b, 29 b-30. The easiest and most satisfactory explanation of the absence of these passages in LXX B is that they are later additions in MT. We may, therefore, safely conclude that ch. 18 as it lies before us in LXX B is the original work of our author, and that the same scribe who inserted in MT 17. 12-31, 55-8, also inserted from the same source 18. 1-5, adding 6 a as a link, and 18. 17-19, which refers back to 17. 25. We may likewise assume that this scribe is also the interpolator of the glossatory amplifications, vers. 8 b, 12 b, 21 b, 26 b, 29 b, and possibly also ver. 30, all of which would be his own composition like 17. 41, 50. It is more difficult to decide the *provenance*

of 18. 10-11. Critics have declared this passage to be a duplicate of 19. 9-10. They maintain that an attempt on David's life was at this stage still premature, since Saul's hatred had not yet reached at this moment such a high degree of intensity as to drive him to commit murder. But have we a right to demand from Saul such a strict 'method in madness'? Who can account for the sudden impulses of a deranged mind? It is true that in 19. 1 f Saul hesitates to take David's life without the consent of Jonathan and his servants, but there he may have been in his normal state of sanity. Again, there is no reason why we should not assume that Saul made two attempts to slay David with his spear. If 19. 9-10 was the second attempt, it would help the better to explain David's desperate resolve to leave the king's court altogether. Further, the style and diction of 18. 10-11 are certainly older than those of 19. 9-10. Note in the first passage *רוח ותצלח* against *רוח ותהי* in 19. 9; *ויתנבא*; the more virile style in 18. 11 as compared with 19. 10; *ויטל* against *ויסב*, and the direct oration in 18. 11, all of which seem to indicate greater originality for the first passage. On the other hand, the absence of this passage from LXX B must be considered decisive against its belonging to the author of our book, though it may very well belong to a source older than our author's own work. We must, therefore, declare this passage a later insertion into the work of our author. It may have been inserted by the same scribe who inserted vers. 1-5, 17-19, but he cannot have taken it from the same source, viz. the original source of ch. 17, since that chapter does not know of Saul's madness and of David's service as his minstrel.

54. (ch. 19.) In ch. 19 the author continues the story of

the ever-widening breach between Saul and David. 19. 1 is the continuation, as in LXX B, of 18. 29 a. Note the full designation יונתן בן שאול, or יהונתן בן שאול, by our own author, as distinguished from the simple יהונתן in 18. 1-4, which is not by our author but is part of the insertion. Further, the statement in 19. 1 b sounds rather tame beside 18. 1, 3-4, which supports our contention that the two passages are not by the same hand. Some critics hold that 19. 2-3 is an interpolation, and that ver. 4 is the direct continuation of ver. 1, as Jonathan should have interceded for David immediately on hearing his father's proposal to slay him. But it is unlikely that Jonathan would have spoken in David's favour while his father's mind was still excited and bent on destroying David. The implication of the text, that Jonathan waited with his intercession until his father's anger had subsided, is no doubt correct. It is, however, difficult to understand why Jonathan should have to speak to Saul in the field. To get rid of this difficulty, as some critics do (cf. Budde, *op. cit.*, 221), by deleting ver. 3 a β (וְאֵלֶּי . . . שָׁם) is arbitrary and violent. It is better to regard ver. 3 as a vague reminiscence of the account in ch. 20, which, as we shall show later (§ 58) was unknown to our author. Perhaps this passage is an abridgement of a longer story parallel to ch. 20.

55. Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 250) and others regard 19. 11-18 as an interpolation, because in ver. 10 b we are told that David had escaped, yet in ver. 11 he is still in his own house. But surely נָס וַיָּמָלֵךְ need mean no more than that he fled from Saul's court to his own house, which was probably situated at some distance from the king's residence, as appears from the wording of ver. 7 b. Note the use of נָס in describing his flight from the presence of the king to

his own house (ver. 10 b) and of ברה in describing his flight from Gibeah to another locality (19. 12, 18; 20. 1; 21. 11. Contrast also, for example, Gen. 39. 13; Num. 16. 34 with 2 Sam. 4. 3; 13. 37, &c.).³²

56. The same judgement has been passed by the critics on 19. 18-24, which they declare to be a late apocryphal story invented to explain the proverb, 'Is Saul among the prophets?' (ver. 24 b). They argue that the explanation of the proverb given here contradicts the earlier and more genuine explanation given in 10. 12. But it is hard to see how this contradiction is removed by assigning our passage to a late writer, who no doubt would have known the explanation in 10. 12. The difficulty may be overcome by taking ver. 24 b as a gloss. But really the difficulty is only of the critics' own making. For, as a matter of fact, the story here is not intended to explain the proverb, but, on the contrary, the proverb is brought in as an illustration and an explanation of the strange and startling conduct of Saul in vers. 23 b, 24 a. The writer explains it by a reference to the well-known proverb which illustrates Saul's susceptibility to prophetic inspiration. He does not assert that his story was the origin of the proverb. Had he meant to say that, he would have expressed himself something in the same way as the earlier writer in 10. 12: על כן היתה למשל. The critics further maintain that our story contradicts 15. 35, according to which Samuel never saw Saul again after his rejection. But this involves a very literal and strained interpretation of 15. 35. All that the passage means to say is that Samuel severed all further connexion and intercourse with Saul throughout his re-

³² Wellhausen (*ibid.* 251) noticed this difference of expression, but failed to grasp its significance.

maining life ; it does not mean to exclude such a chance meeting as is described in our story.

57. Finally, the critics argue that the right course for David in his flight from Saul was to go straight to the South on his way to his home in Judah. He could not have gone northwards from Gibeah to Ramah 'just for mere fun' ('*zum Spass*', Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, 250). To this we answer that David was too wise and too cautious to have adopted the plan of the critics. Had he gone straight South, he would have placed his old parents and all his family in a very dangerous position, without being able to offer them any help against Saul's certain vengeance. The fate of the priests of Nob would no doubt have befallen the whole of Jesse's clan, and perhaps the whole of Bethlehem. When David was finally forced into open outlawry, he was immediately joined by his whole clan for fear of Saul, and he took the precaution of removing his old parents out of the reach of Saul's vengeance, and placing them with Saul's enemy the king of Moab (22. 1, 3-4, cf. above, § 49). The fact is that at the stage reached by our story in 19. 18, David had not yet given up all hope of an ultimate reconciliation with the king. Saul's son and heir was his devoted friend ; Saul's daughter was his loving wife ; he himself was the darling of the army and a favourite with all the people ; the prophets and priests were also his friends (cf. § 25). He felt himself innocent of any offence against the king. Why should he abandon his country and his people and turn an outlaw at the accidental outburst against him of an insane man ? Therefore he fled to Samuel with a view to finding a shelter with the prophet until the king's mind should return to sanity. But finding that he was not safe at Ramah, David was obliged to flee south-

wards, and first he stopped at Nob to seek shelter there with his friends the priests (21. 2 ff.). The naïve innocence of Ahimelek and the presence at Nob of Doeg (cf. 22. 22) soon, however, convinced David that he could not remain there much longer, and so he departed hastily and resumed his wanderings in search of a temporary asylum from Saul's madness (21. 11). But he carefully avoided returning to Bethlehem or its neighbourhood, for fear of involving its people in trouble with Saul. Further, a little consideration should have convinced our critics that 19. 18-24 cannot be a late production. The details of the school of prophets attached to Samuel's sanctuary just outside Ramah (cf. 9. 25 a), and of the workings of the prophetic frenzy, show clearly that our story is related to 10. 5-6, 10-13, and to the stories of the 'sons of the prophets' at the sanctuaries of Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal (2 Kings 2. 3, 5; 4, 38 ff. Note יושבים לפני; 6. 1 f, &c.), and must, therefore, belong to a pretty early date. We may therefore, without any hesitation, declare our passage to be genuine and original to our author. Thus, the whole ch. 19 is found to be a unity and the work of the author of our book.

58. (ch. 20,) Ch. 20 seems irreconcilable with ch. 19. Jonathan would not have affirmed ignorance of his father's designs against David after the events described in 19. 11 ff; and David would not have sought for another test of Saul's mind after his flight from Gibeah and the king's repeated attempts to seize him. Nor would Saul have expected David to attend the royal table after the final breach between them detailed in ch. 19. We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that ch. 20 is not by the same author as ch. 19, i.e. it is not by the author of our book. The continuation of 20. 1 a is 21. 2, viz. ויברח דוד מניית ברמה ויבא

נבה אל אח' &c. in 21. 2 a may be an addition after the insertion into our text of 20. 1 b-21. 1. The insertion of ch. 20 must have been made before the insertion in chs. 17, 18, since ch. 20 is found also in LXX B. The text of this chapter is not wholly original. Vers. 11-17 are probably an addition by the scribe who inserted the chapter into our book. For the answer to David's question in ver. 10 is not given till ver. 18, which must originally have followed immediately on ver. 10. There is, however, no reason to doubt with some critics the genuineness of vers. 4-10, since ver. 6 is necessary for ver. 29. That ver. 5 is also repeated in ver. 18 f. should occasion no difficulty. In ver. 18 f. Jonathan is merely recapitulating in its entirety the common plan, the first part of which was suggested by David in ver. 5.

59. The critics have also declared vers. 40-42 to be an interpolation. Their reason is that if an interview between the two friends had been possible, then the whole device of the sign by the arrows was altogether unnecessary. But, on the other hand, ver. 40 reads as the natural continuation of ver. 39, and ver. 41 as the continuation of ver. 40. There is no sign whatever of any break at ver. 39, nor does that verse read like the conclusion of the preceding account. Again, if 21. 1 be thought the direct continuation of 20. 39 and the conclusion of the account, then the order of the clauses in 21. 1 should have been reversed: first the clause about Jonathan, who is the actor in the preceding verses (20. 34-9), and then the clause about David, who is the actor in the following verses (21. 2 ff.). There is, therefore, no doubt that vers. 40-42 are an integral part of ch. 20. It is true that the interview after the sign of the arrows is quite illogical, yet it is, nevertheless, characteristically

human and psychologically correct. This interview was, indeed, very dangerous to both of them, yet it did take place, because the sentiments and emotions of the friends overruled the dictates of their cold reason. Jonathan must have found it hard to return to the town immediately in the company of his lad. He no doubt lingered behind for a while in the hope of catching, perhaps, a glimpse, maybe the last one, of his beloved friend. David, on his part, when he saw that the lad had gone, and Jonathan had remained alone, in the impulse of the moment cast all caution to the winds, and rushed forth from his hiding-place towards his friend and protector; and the emotional Jonathan yielded to the longing of his heart to embrace his friend and offer him his last farewell.

60. As to the source of ch. 20, it may, perhaps, have been the same document from which our author had borrowed ch. 17 f. The warmheartedness of Jonathan and the generous devotion to his friend displayed in this chapter recall Jonathan's sudden outburst of love in 18. 1 ff. rather than the tame friendship of 19. 1 b. Note also the reference to their covenant in 20. 8, which must refer to 18. 3. On the other hand, כפשע³³ in 20. 3 seems to refer back to 18. 11 (less probably to 19. 10). Indeed, 20. 1 b would form an excellent continuation to 18. 11. But, as we have noted above (§ 53), 18. 10-11 (or 19. 9-10) cannot belong to the source of chs. 17-18. 5, since that source is ignorant of David's activity as the king's musician. However, this much we may assert with a certain degree of assurance, that ch. 20 was inserted into the work of our author by an early scribe, and that the original portions of this chapter

³³ Cf. Rashi and the other Hebrew commentators *ad loc.* The 5 is the *kaph veritatis*; cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Grammar*, § 118 x.

(i. e. vers. 1 b–10, 18–21. 1) are derived from an old source which was either ignored by, or unknown to, the author of our book.

61. (ch. 21.) The author's own narrative, which was interrupted in 20. 1 a, is resumed in 21. 2 and continued throughout the chapter. Budde (*op. cit.*, 226) has rightly defended the genuineness of vers. 8–10. These verses are an essential part of the story, for the possession of a sword was almost as necessary to David as the possession of bread. Ver. 8 is not, as Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 251) asserts, a rehash of 22. 9. On the contrary, 22. 9 is dependent on this verse. Here Doeg is introduced as an unknown person, his name, origin, and occupation are described, and also the cause of his presence at Nob. In 22. 9, on the other hand, Doeg is mentioned simply by his name without any further introduction, such as 'ויען איש ושמו ד', as one who is already known to the reader; only a clause is added explaining the presence of the chief shepherd in Saul's court. גלית in ver. 10, as in 22. 10, is a gloss, as stated above (§ 30). The account of the visit to Nob ends in ver. 10 rather abruptly, and is probably in a fragmentary condition.

62. 21. 11–16 has been condemned by all critics as a late interpolation. The strange story is ingeniously explained by the critics as a late insertion which had its origin in the desire to explain away as unhistorical the well-known story of David's residence in the Philistine court given in 27. 2 ff. David's vassalage to the Philistine enemy of his people was considered unworthy of the future great king, and so this story was invented and designed to take the place of chs. 27. 2–28. 2; 29–30; II, 1. In other words, the story here is a pious fraud, which, however, failed in

its object, since it did not succeed in eliminating from our book and destroying the chapters just enumerated. Now, we ask, can any one really believe that if redactors had thought David's vassalage an act of treason, and had really desired to obliterate its memory from future generations, they would not, with all the resourcefulness and adroitness ascribed to them by the critics, have found better means for carrying out their object than the futile invention and interpolation of this anecdote here? The hypothesis has only to be stated in its plain nakedness to be laughed out of court. The fact is that the ancient Hebrews could not, any more than the ancient Greeks in a similar case, see anything treasonable or dishonourable in David's vassalage. We find nowhere any censure on David for his connexion with the Philistines. And we have no right to ascribe to the ancients our modern conception of patriotism and honour. What, then, it may be asked, has forced the critics to this strange theory? The same reason which forced them to declare 19. 18-24 spurious, viz. that David had refused to adopt their plan and run straight from Gibeah to Bethlehem. But, as we have pointed out in our discussion of the latter passage (§ 57), David did not go straight home, because he did not wish to turn himself and all his clan into open outlaws and rebels. He first sought a refuge with his friends the prophets (19. 18-24) and the priests (21. 2-10), and having failed in this, he resolved to hide himself abroad for a time until he should find it safe to return to his home at Gibeah. The earliest and the most obvious plan was to conceal his identity and go to Philistia, where he would be within easy reach both of Gibeah and of Bethlehem. This he did, but to his dismay he found that the Philistines had dis-

covered his identity.³⁴ To escape death he had to prove that he was not the renowned Israelite champion, and so he feigned madness and was expelled from the Philistine court. His repeated failures to find a temporary asylum forced him at last to take to the wilds of Judea and adopt the life of an outlaw (22. 1). The story must appear quite plain and reasonable to those whose minds are not obsessed by any preconceived notions. The critics take offence at ver. 11 a, which they think superfluous after 19. 18 a; 20. 1 a. But the statement of this clause is necessary here, for it really means to say that David fled from the country of Israel ruled by Saul and went abroad. Cf. the similar statement in Jonah 1. 3 a. Again, the expression מֶלֶךְ הָאֲרֶץ in ver. 12 has given the critics, as well as the commentators, a great deal of trouble. But it is really nothing more than an anachronism, such as we have already met with before in this book (cf. § 42).

³⁴ That David sought to remain incognito at Akish's court is evident from the words in ver. 12: !... הָלַא לָזֶה !... הָלַא זֶה דָּוִד.

(To be continued.)